

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed July 12, 2005, within the three month time period for reply extending to October 12, 2005. The current status of the claims is summarized below.

5 Claims 11, 14-20, 21-22, 24-27, 34, 38-40, and 45 are currently amended.

 Claims 2-3, 12-13, 23, 31-33, 42, and 49 are cancelled.

 Claims 1, 4-11, 14-22, 24-30, 34-41, 43-48, and 50-51 are pending in the application after entry of the present Amendment.

10 **Allowable Subject Matter**

 The Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 1, 4-10, 35-37, and 44. Also, the Applicant acknowledges that each of claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. 101.

15

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

 Claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are traversed.

 Each of claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 have been amended to recite a computer
20 readable medium including program instructions for processing image data. The computer readable medium is statutory subject matter. Therefore, the Office is requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 of amended claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45.

25

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office
5 asserts that claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 recite computer readable code that is not present in the computer usable medium. These rejections are traversed.

As discussed above with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, each of claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium including program instructions for processing image data. The program instructions
10 recited in each of claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 represent a portion of the program instructions for processing image data that are included within the computer readable medium. The Applicant submits that amended claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regard as the invention. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112
15 of amended claims 11, 14-20, 38-40, and 45.

Claims 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. These rejections are traversed.

The Office has asserted that the omitted steps in claims 23-26 are the mapping
20 operations found in the last three lines of claim 1. However, the mapping operations of claim 1 are actually the features recited in previously pending claim 23 (which incorporates the features of claim 22). Therefore, the Applicant does not understand the Office's reasoning in asserting that the mapping operations of claim 1 are omitted from previously pending claims 23-26. The Office is requested to note that claim 23 has been
25 cancelled and claims 24-26 have been amended in response to the outstanding rejections

under 35 U.S.C. 102. Thus, the Applicant requests the Office to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 of claims 24-26.

Claim 49 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 49 has been cancelled.

5

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21-30, 34, 41, 43, and 46-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salesky et al. ("Salesky" hereafter) (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0080504). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

10 Claim 21 has been amended to clarify that the server is configured to obtain image data and perform a mapping of at least one clipping region to said image data to obtain clipped image data. The server of amended claim 21 is further clarified as being configured to perform the mapping by determining a nearest pixel in said image data to a location in said at least one clipping region.

15 The Applicant submits that Salesky does not teach a server that is configured to obtain image data and perform a mapping of a clipping region to the image data to obtain clipped image data. Moreover, Salesky does not teach that the server is configured to perform the mapping by determining a nearest pixel in the image data to a location in the clipping region. The Office has also indicated that the prior art of record,
20 including Salesky, fails to teach or suggest a server configured to perform the mapping of the clipping region to the image data as recited in amended claim 21.

 In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Salesky fails to teach each and every feature of amended claim 21, as required to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claim 21 and each of its
25 dependent claims 22, 24-30, 41, 46-48, and 50-51 are patentable over Salesky. Thus, the

Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 21-22, 24-30, 41, 46-48, and 50-51.

Claim 34 has been amended to recite means on a server for mapping at least one clipping region to image data to obtain clipped image data. More specifically, amended
5 claim 34 recites that the mapping includes determining a nearest pixel in the image data to a location in the clipping region.

The Applicant submits that Salesky does not teach means on a server for mapping of a clipping region to image data to obtain clipped image data. Moreover, Salesky does not teach that the mapping, as performed by the means on the server, includes determining
10 a nearest pixel in the image data to a location in the clipping region. The Office has also indicated that the prior art of record, including Salesky, fails to teach or suggest a server configured to perform the mapping of the clipping region to the image data as recited in amended claim 34.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Salesky fails to teach each
15 and every feature of amended claim 34, as required to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 34 and 43 are patentable over Salesky. Thus, the Office is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 34 and 43.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims (1, 4-11, 14-22, 24-30, 34-41, 43-48, and 50-51) are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6914. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP572). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Kenneth D. Wright
Reg. No. 53,795

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32,291